DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 519 EA 010 619

AUTHOR Hickcox, Edward S.
TITLE O Say Can You See Our Home and Native Land.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Ontario, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Administrator Education; College Faculty; *Cultural Differences; Departments; *Educational Administration; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Intellectual Disciplines; *Nationalism; Professional Training; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

Educational administration as a field of study is inextricably tied to American-developed conceptual frameworks, even when educational administration is pursued as a domain of inquiry in other countries, such as Canada. As an applied discipline, however, educational administration reflects the particular cultural configuration in which it is practiced. Certain Canadian-oriented issues, such as governmental relations, nationalism, Canadian-oriented instructional materials, and organizational affiliation, modify the application of American-generated principles to the practice of educational administration. But in most respects the differences between educational administration in Canada and the United States are insignificant. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154519

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward S. Hickcox

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

O Say Can You See
Our Home and Native Land

by

Edward S. Hickcox

Department of Educational Administration
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

I. INTRODUCTION

Two assumptions underlie this discussion. The first is that Educational Administration as a field of study is inextricably tied to American-developed conceptual frameworks, and this relationship holds no matter where Educational Administration is pursued as a domain of inquiry. Second, as an applied discipline, Educational Administration reflects the particular cultural configuration in which it is practiced, and it is thus possible to identify certain characteristics of Educational Administration unique to Canada, or Australia, or England, or, in fact, New York or Mississippi. These assumptions will be develcped further, and an attempt will be made to describe certain issues in Canada which modify the behavior of educational leaders at the university level as they seek to utilize the tools and concepts of the discipline within a particular cultural and social environment.

EA 010 619

These assumptions, partially contradictory as they are, provide both a yes and a no answer to the question of whether there is a field of Canadian Educational Administration, a question which follows from the title of the symposium, "What's So Canadian About Canadian Educational Administration?" Decore (1976) posed the same question in a discussion about Canadian Sociology of Education.

The particular perspective from which the discussion will be pursued is related to the experience of the author. He studied Educational Administration at three different American universities, was a professor of Educational Administration for six years at OISE, then for four years at the State University of New York at Albany. In 1977, he returned to OISE's Department of Educational Administration as Chairperson. In addition, he is familiar with Departments of Educational Administration across North America through professional activities in UCEA, CASEA and other organizations. The context, therefore, is that of an academic department within a university setting.

II. NATIONAL ANTECEDENTS

The history of Educational Administration as a field of study has been well documented. (Culbertson, et al, 1973 Cunningham, et al, 1977). Most of the important points in that history occurred within an American context and at American universities. The Kellogg Project, the Midwest Administration Center, the theory movement, UCEA, were or are American-based phenomena.

In Canada, only one university, the University of Alberta, embraced the theory-based movement in Administration at an early stage, that is in the 50's, and it is interesting to note the tie-in between Alberta and the University of Chicago. Many of its professors were trained there, and Alberta graduates were steeped in the ideologies associated with the scientific approach to the study of Administration. Other universities in Canada have developed Educational Administration programs--most notably, OISE, the University of British Columbia, and Memorial University. Presen ly, there are at least eight institutions offering doctoral-level programs. Most of these centres embraced staffing patterns that brought in Alberta graduates, or students of Alberta graduates, or graduates of major American centres such as Chicago and Oregon.

In a sense, then, at the conceptual level, at least in the beginning, the training, values, ideologies, methodologies and ways of knowing in Canadian universities clearly reflected the central thrust of Educational Administration as it was developing in the United States.

The structure of programs in Administration hardly differs between U.S. and Canadian Departments. In the writer's most recent experiences, at the State University of New York at Albany and OISE, there are two basic courses in Administration, utilizing pretty much the same materials; there are more advanced courses in the politics of education, finance, human relations and organizational development, research design, and statistics. The dissertation process is basically the same.

We could document similar comparisons in research efforts and in development. (See Thom and Hickcox, 1973.)

A number of Canadian professors have carried out distinguished careers at influential American universities, most notably at the University of Chicago. J. Alan Thomas, Dan Lortie, and Donald Erickson are three professors who were at Chicago in its glory days, and one could argue that some sort of Canadian viewpoint was reflected in the development of the field through their efforts.

The point remains, however, that the intellectual basis of our field, the general definition of the domain, and the paradigm (if we dare to speak in such bold language) come from American universities and have been shaped by American scholars and practitioner-scholars. Further, in contrast to some other fields such as sociology, no other alternatives are available. Decore (1976) for example, speaks of the influence of British sociology. In Educational Administration, no alternative approach to the study of school governance has developed. Such alternatives may come about in the future, perhaps in Canada, or Australia, or Britain, but to this point the major influences on programs in those countries have an American origin and the American model is the only one fully developed.

III. ISSUES FROM THE DEPARTMENTAL PERSPECTIVE

While we cannot identify any particular Canadian orientation to the study of Educational Administration, we are able to specify a number of Canadian-oriented issues which modify the application

of principles to the practice of administration. In this sense, we argue that there is a Canadian field of Educational Administration. We argue, further, that since Educational Administration is an applied field, one which draws from a number of basic disciplines for its models, it is in some sense defined by its applied nature. Several issues which serve to define the Canadian nature of Educational Administration are identified and discussed in the remainder of this section.

A. Governmental Relations

One of the areas where, from the department point of view, there is a substantial difference between Canada and the United States is in the matter of governmental relations. Warren's presentation in this symposium will speak to this issue, and there is ample documentation (Fleming, 1971, Martin and Macdonell, 1978) to attest to the fact that the provincial government as opposed to either the local or federal levels exercises greater control over educational matters than is true in the United States. This is a complicated matter, of course, and we do not propose to extricate all those complexities here. For example, according to Fleming (1971), the struggle to define local control versus provincial control of education has been central in the history of school governance in Ontario. The same issue has characterized the history of school governance in the United States, but it appears to this writer that at least in the Eastern part of the U.S. the early years showed almost total control at the local level with a gradual increase in state and

federal control beginning after World War II. In Ontario, however, with the strong leadership of Ryerson during the latter part of the 19th century, provincial control was paramount at the beginning, and the question of local versus provincial influence has been argued and examined from the perspective of decreasing provincial control rather than of increasing state and federal control as in the United States. There are, of course, a variety of patterns in the U.S. (see Iannaccone, 1967) as there are in Canada so that generalization is difficult.

From the perspective of a Department of Educational Administration, the differences in the locus of control have several implications. This writer finds himself dealing frequently in cooperative efforts with Ministry, local officials and university personnel on a number of issues ranging from in-service training for administrators to cooperative research projects. One naturally thinks of counsulting with Ministry officials on major problems. The degree of cooperation, at least at the Department level, is far less in most U.S. Departments of Educational Administration. There, a professor or a Department Chairman might approach state or federal authorities for funding, but there is less likelihood of a firm, long-term, ongoing cooperative relationship. While there is a greater sense of stimulation in Canada from the high contacts with government officials, there is also more vulnerability and more necessity for Departments to play a political role in order to move toward goals and objectives.

There is a tendency, also, for Departments to relate to province-wide organizations rather than to local constituencies. At OISE, for example, there is heavy involvement with the Ontario School Trustees' Council, the provincial administrators' organization, even the Ontario Teachers' Federation. In the United States, the tendency would be for Departments to relate to local or regional organizations rather than to state-wide organizations. The turf is divided up in the United States.

B. Nationalism and National Unity

The Media in Canada are full of references to Canadian nationalism, the search for a national identity, and the struggle to preserve national unity. In fact, the threat to unity through the threatened break-up of federation has modified the general concern with the encroachment of American culture onto the Canadian way of doing things.

At the level of Educational Administration, this writer has some personal and perhaps biased observations. When he first came to Canada in 1967, he found himself in a Department which had a preponderance of Americans, and professors who were not American had more often than not been trained in the United States. That this situation might cause some constraints on behavior had not occurred to him when he initially "crossed the border." He was only conscious in 1967 of the fact that he would not be permitted to bring more than twenty-five sheep with him, according to the small print in the forms. The situation, however, was quite sensitive.

Influential educators in Ontario at least, and perhaps to a lesser extent in other provinces, were concerned about the "American" influence. In recruiting, for example, it was always necessary to consider the national origin of the candidate. In public presentations, one always had to be careful about making references to the situation in the United States. On one notable occasion in the late '60s, pickets paraded outside of the Institute with signs advising, "Yankee, Go Home."

This is not to suggest that the situation was serious enough to prevent effective performance. But it was a phenomenon somewhat unique for the average American moving to Canada. Since Americans in Canada do not constitute an organized minority (The Pitman Report in Ontario, for example, does not recognize Americans as a minority group), the tendency was to deal with any problems on an individual basis and to adopt a modified "Uncle Tom" stance. One time, the writer was delivering a talk to a group of school trustees in Ontario four years after his arrival in the country. One trustee got up during the discussion section and noted that the speaker had developed an accent practically indistinguishable from a Canadian accent, and the implication was that this made a difference in acceptance.

The situation in 1978 seems to have changed considerably and in the direction of decreased concern with the issue. On the one hand, of course, economic downturns in both Canada and the United States have resulted in much stricter immigration regulations, and movement in either direction is much more

difficult. On the other hand, in the ten years since 1967, many more Canadians have been trained in Educational Administration and are filling positions in universities in greater proportions. The concern also seems to have shifted from the problem of American influence to developing appropriate responses to Canadian problems, without quite the nervousness about who is framing the response. In a way, there are now more typical concerns being expressed about the gap between theory and practice and the isolation of academics.

In my own institution, there are a number of Americans who came in the late '60s and have remained in the Department. They have become thoroughly Canadianized, I think, in the sense of having grasped the unique field problems in Administration. For the most part, they are being accepted for the expertise and ideas they can bring to the particular situation.

The issue, now, it seems to this writer, is to ensure that some flow of ideas and individuals is maintained across the border. There is danger, now, of an increasing insularity, and effort should be made to foster exchanges which will bring benefit to the field in a variety of contexts, geographical and otherwise. In the end, as indicated in the introduction to this paper, the applied nature of our field will dictate a unique response to local problems, a response based hopefully on some general theoretical knowledges independent of national origin.

C. Canadian Content

One of the perplexing problems facing Departments of Educational Administration in Canada is to utilize materials in training and development that have some significance in the Canadian context. Whereas there is no problem at the conceptual level, there is a concern that meaning and understanding will suffer at the transition stage between theory and practice.

In 1973, the Canadian Education Association published a bibliography of materials in Educational Administration with a Canadian orientation (Thom and Hickcox, 1973). The titles of these several hundred items do not reflect too much, however, a unique Canadian content. There are exceptions, of course. Musella and Joyce (1972), for example, designed an extensive set of simulation materials within a Canadian setting. Many studies and dissertations utilized samples and respondents from Canada. One can question, however, whether the extensive studies in bureaucracy done at Alberta and OISE in years past (Mackay, 1964, Anderson, 1971, Punch, 1970, Robinson, 1967) would have turned out differently if respondents from American settings had been used.

A recent text in Educational Administration by Gue (1977) attempts to utilize a preponderance of studies and references from Canadian sources. A perusal of the contents, however, reveals striking similarities to American texts of the same genre, although it may be true that students will be more at home with the Canadian references. A decision to use the

text, however, given the similarities, would probably be made on grounds other than national origin.

The real problem, it seems to me, is not one of a desire to use American-based materials, with essentially irrelevant discussions of racial problems, affirmative action, and similar concerns, but of the necessity to use them. Canadian writers do not have the market to motivate extensive production of high quality Canadian textbook and ancilliary materials. Further, there may be two-hundred professors of Educational Administration in Canada as opposed to several thousand in the United States. The potential for extensive production of materials is limited.

In this area, however, there is a great opportunity, one which may result in the design of a genuine Canadian domain in Educational Administration. Given the somewhat limited potential for Canadian materials for use in training or development, the opportunity is to integrate those materials extant or being developed in conjunction with appropriate materials from the United States, Australia, England or wherever significant work in Administration is being done. The resulting mix of sources could provide an extraordinarily rich background for students and practitioners in Canada. What might characterize professors of Educational Administration in Canada is the ability to integrate ideas from a variety of sources in ways appropriate for local consumption.

D. Organizational Affiliation

One of the problems for those interested in fostering a special Canadian orientation to Educational Administration is the difficulty in building associations within the Canadian environment that will foster the exchange of ideas and cement professional friendships to the ultimate benefit of our field. Canada is plagued by having a small population spread out over a vast geography. The problem is further complicated by the lack of national focus in education. Martin and MacDonnell (1978) attempt to describe a national system of education in sociological terms. They fail. Instead, they define ten separate systems of education. This same theme is echoed in Holdaway's unpublished paper for the Fourth International Intervisitation Program scheduled for Canada in May of 1978.

Most of us, therefore, foster multiple associations. We are active in AERA and to some extent UCEA. Particularly, those who have "crossed the border" tend to maintain American contacts, not from any sense of nationalism but from a professional viewpoint. At the same time, we attempt to foster Canadian associations. In some senses we spread ourselves too thin. It is this writer's viewpoint that Canadians should not squander their energies in creating mirror image national organizations which have no hope of matching the potential resource and personnel pools available to the large American professional organizations. Some new models are called for--models which will allow Canadians to have entry to the American Educational Administration network

while at the same time providing opportunity for purely Canadian professional interaction.

IV. CONFRONTING THE IMPORTANT ISSUES

This paper concludes with a personal note and a caveat.

There is a most select group among Educational Administration professors who could be labelled multiple border crossers. I have crossed the border twice into Canada. Don Erickson has crossed twice into the United States. Robin Farquhar started in Canada, went to the United States and returned to Canada. There may be others. Whatever the reasons the others may have had, I must say that mine were purely professional. Since returning the second time, I have had all kinds of questions about whether my feeling for Canada prompted my return, whether I was upset at President Carter or felt that the United States should not give away the Panama Canal, and similar comments. To be perfectly frank, I returned because there was a job opportunity I wished to pursue. Of course, a move for me seems to be part of a life pattern. So far I have lived in Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Oregon, Minnesota and Ontario. Dick Carlson could hardly label me as place bound. And having lived in a number of places, I am more and more struck by the insignificant nature of boundaries when it comes to the practice of our trade. In most respects on the job, the differences between Educational Administration in Canada and the United States are insignificant. This is not

to say that there are no national differences. In fact, while I may lack the stability that comes with having concentrated effort in one location, the differences between living in New England, in Oregon, and in Ontario are what add zest and interest to routine activities.

A year or two ago, R. Jean Hills from the University of British Columbia wrote an unpublished paper (Hills, 1976) in which he tried to describe differences in values and value systems in the United States and Canada, especially related to education. In general, his conclusion was that there are some differences but they are not dramatic. The United States may be characterized by more adaptive values (in the Parsonian sense), with an individualistic emphasis. In Canada there is more emphasis on integrative values and lesser prominence on pattern-maintenance values. There is more emphasis on collectivity than on individuality. Tolerance and compromise are the only really valued achievements in Canadian society. I think these and other comments in the paper have some significance and reflect a certain reality. But I am struck throughout Hills' paper with the thought that the differences are not really pronounced and for the life of me I cannot conceive that our field would look dramatically different if we were to consciously design Canadian Educational Administration according to a Canadian value system. Perhaps in our efforts to design something unique, we are struggling and laboring too much, with a resulting loss of effectiveness.

What I really feel about all this is related to the assumptions stated at the beginning. It seems to me that we need to engage in studies and thinking about educational organizations quite apart from nationalistic considerations. And then we need to deliver the results of our studies within some local context, a context which will be unique for that locality, calling for a different approach in Ontario compared to British Columbia, or Newfoundland, or Texas.

We've got some special problems in Canada in Educational Administration, related to the values discussed above, to geography, to history, to sparse population, to distance. The discussion and the effort should not centre around whether the approaches used are Canadian or American but around whether we have the intelligence, will, and talent to meet the problems as they exist.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. D. "Bureaucracy In Schools and Student Alienation." The Canadian Administrator, 11, No. 3, December, 1971, pp. 9-12.

Culbertson, Jack; Farquhar, Robin; Fogarty, Bryce; and Shibles, Mark Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders, Columbus: C. E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973.

Cunningham, L. L., Hack, Walter, and Nystrand, Raphael. Educational Administration: The Developing Decades, Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.

Decore, A. M. "Is There Anything Canadian About the Sociology of Education in Canada?" unpublished paper, Department of Educational Foundations, Edmonton, 1976.

Fleming, W. G. Ontario's Educative Society: The Administrative Structure, Vol. II, Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Gue, L. R. An Introduction to Educational Administration in Canada, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1977.

Hills, R. J. "Societal and Educational Values in the United States and Canada: A Tentative Comparison." Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Administration in Education, The University of British Columbia, 1976.

Iannaccone, L. Politics in Education, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967.

Mackay, D. A. "Research on Bureaucracy in Schools: The Unfolding of a Strategy." The Journal of Educational Administration, 7, No. 1, May, 1969, pp. 37-44.

Martin, W. B. W. and Macdonell, A. J. Canadian Education: A Sociological Analysis. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1978.

Musella, D. F. and Joyce, H. D. The Area Superintendent: An In-Basket Simulation Exercise. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1973. (This is one of a series.)

Punch, K. F. "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools: Towards Re-definition and Measurement." Educational Administration Quarterly, 5, No. 2, Spring, 1969, pp. 43-57.

Robinson, N. "Teacher Professionalism and Bureaucracy in School Organizations." Canadian Education and Research Digest, 7, No. 1, March, 1967, pp. 29-46.

Thom, D. J. and Hickcox, E. S. A Selected Bibliography of Educational Administration: A Canadian Orientation, Toronto: The Canadian Education Association, 1973.